



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,857	05/05/2005	Dirk Waldbauer	AP 10563	2901
7590 Gerlinde M Nattler Continental Teves, Inc One continental Drive Auburn Hills, MI 48326				
04/03/2008				
EXAMINER				
YEAGLEY, DANIEL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3611				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,857

Applicant(s)

WALDBAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Yeagley

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 35-72 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 35 – 63, drawn to a method for stabilizing a car-trailer combination.

Group II, claim(s) 64 – 72, drawn to a device for stabilizing a car-trailer combination.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: group I lacks unity with group II, since claim 35 does not include the same or corresponding special technical feature as set forth in claim 64.

3. This application further contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species A, the embodiment wherein a driving stability control controls a brake pressure based on a deceleration quantity.

Species B, the embodiment wherein a decelerating of the vehicle is based upon monitored rolling motions.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

4. This application further contains claims directed to more than one subspecies of the generic invention. These subspecies are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The sub-species are as follows:

Subspecies 1, the embodiment wherein deceleration demand based on a driving stability control of a brake control based on an ETR control system (figure 2, page 22-26).

Sub-Species 2, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration demand is dependant upon an ESP control system (page 15-21).

Applicant is further required, in reply to this action, to elect a single subspecies to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

5. This application still further contains claims directed to more than one further subspecies of the generic invention. Upon election of Subspecies 1 or 2 above applicant is further required to elect one of the following single disclose sub-species. These sub-species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. The further sub-species are as follows:

Sub-Species a, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration demand is dependant upon assessment of temporal aspects (as best understood from page 17).

Sub-Species b, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration demand is dependant upon feedback of deceleration for determining brake pressures (page 17).

Sub-Species c, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration demand is dependant upon transition to non-decelerated driving state (page 17-18).

Sub-Species d, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration demand is dependant upon slip and deceleration of the wheels and locking criteria (page 18).

Sub-Species e, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration is dependant upon wheel pressure and locking criteria (page 18).

Sub-Species f, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration demand is dependant upon deceleration intervention (page 18-19).

Applicant is further required, in reply to this action, to elect a single subspecies to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

6. This application still further contains claims directed to more than one further subspecies of the generic invention. If applicant elects Sub-Species (f) above; applicant is further required to elect one of the following single disclose sub - species. These sub - species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The sub-species are as follows:

sub - species i, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration intervention uses a slip monitoring system (page 20).

sub - species ii, the embodiment of the method wherein deceleration intervention uses a reference speed signal (page 20-21).

If applicant elects sub – species f; applicant is further required, in reply to this action, to further elect a single sub - species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

7. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

8. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species A, corresponds to claim 64.

Species B, corresponds to claim 35.

Subspecies 2, the embodiment of the method dependant upon an ESP control system corresponds to claim 64.

Due to the extraordinary number of variations of species and subspecies, the examiner is requesting applicants' assistance in categorizing the claims to their respective species and subspecies.

9. The following claim(s) are generic: none of the claims appear generic.

10. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features; as specifically noted in each particular embodiment cited in applicants' specification.

11. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species and subspecies or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

12. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Yeagley whose telephone number is (571)272-6655. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley D. Morris can be reached on (571) - 272 - 6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

D.Y.

**/Lesley D. Morris/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3611**